

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/701,538	11/05/2003	Timothy J. Moulsley	PHB 34,266A	8256	
24737	7590 02/11/2005		EXAMINER		
PHILIPS IN	TELLECTUAL PROPER	TORRES, J	TORRES, JOSEPH D		
P.O. BOX 300 BRIARCLIFF	01 FMANOR, NY 10510	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	,		2133		
			DATE MAILED: 02/11/2009	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	Application No. Applicant(s)					
		10/701,5	38	MOULSLEY, TIMOTHY J.				
	Office Action Summary	Examine	•	Art Unit				
		Joseph D		2133				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the	e cover sheet with the c	correspondence ad	idress			
THE - External after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no eveply within the stated will apply and witte, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be tin utory minimum of thirty (30) day ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from lication to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered time the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ly. communication.			
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24	November 2	004.					
2a)⊠	∑ This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.							
3)□¹	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 10-21 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 10-21 is/are rejected: Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicati	on Papers							
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Exami. The drawing(s) filed on 24 November 2004 is Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the	s/are: a)⊠ a ne drawing(s) t ection is requir	be held in abeyance. See ed if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) □ All b) □ Some * c) □ None of: 1. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/348,958. 3. □ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachmen								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) 🔲 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 r No(s)/Mail Date	08)	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		O-152)			

Art Unit: 2133

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Drawings

1. In view of the amendment filed 11/24/2004, all objections to the drawings are withdrawn.

Claim Objections

2. In view of the amendment filed 11/24/2004, all objections to the claims in the previous Office Action are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 3. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 11 is incomprehensible. In particular, it is not clear what "corresponding bits" refers to and how any correspondence of interleaved words to the matrix or matching pattern exists.
- 4. Claims 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See

Art Unit: 2133

MPEP § 2172.01. It is not clear what "corresponding bits" refers to and how any correspondence of interleaved words to the matrix or matching pattern exists.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- 5. Claims 1, 3, 10 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by the 3GPP document (3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP);Technical Specification Group (TSG) Radio Access Network (RAN); Working Group 1 (WG1); Multiplexing and channel coding (FDD), TS 25.212 V1.0.0 (1999-04)).

35 U.S.C. 102(a) rejection of claims 1 and 10.

3GPP document teaches a coding circuit configured to generate a coded output from a digital input (see Channel coding device in Figure 4-1 on page 9 of the 3GPP document); an interleaving circuit configured to generate a plurality of interleaved words from said coded output (see 1st interleaving device in Figure 4-1 on page 9 of the 3GPP document); and a rate matching circuit for adjusting the number of bits in a data block comprising said plurality of interleaved words, the coded output having a greater number of bits than the digital input, the rate matching circuit having means for adjusting the number of bits in the data block using a rate matching pattern to provide data bits for

Art Unit: 2133

transmission during respective frames of a transmission channel (see Rate matching device in Figure 4-1 on page 9 of the 3GPP document), and means for selecting the rate matching pattern depending on an associated bit deletion or repetition pattern (see Rate matching section on page 19 of the 3GPP document) that is selected to ensure that deleted or repeated bits of the data block are not required to enable all bits from the digital input to be reconstructed (the Rate matching section on page 19 of the 3GPP document emphasizes quality of transmission requirements, which can only be achieved by ensuring none of the required bits for error correction coding are lost, that is by ensuring sufficient bits to reconstruct the original data exist at the decoder).

35 U.S.C. 102(a) rejection of claim 3.

Separate rate matching units are provided for each sub-block of a parallel input stream in Figure 4-1 on pager 9 of the 3GPP document.

35 U.S.C. 102(a) rejection of claim 12.

The convolutional encoder on page 12 in the 3GPP document encompasses fixed rate encoders.

35 U.S.C. 102(a) rejection of claims 13-15.

The Interelaver in the 3GPP document is not adaptive and any interleaver inherently has a constant bit rate.

Art Unit: 2133

35 U.S.C. 102(a) rejection of claim 16.

See Rate matching section on page 19 of the 3GPP document.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 6. Claims 4 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the 3GPP document (3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP);Technical Specification Group (TSG) Radio Access Network (RAN); Working Group 1 (WG1); Multiplexing and channel coding (FDD), TS 25.212 V1.0.0 (1999-04)) in view of Okumura et al. (Okumura, Y.; Adachi, F.; Variable rate transmission and blind rate detection for coherent DS-CDMA mobile radio, Electronics Letters, Volume: 33, Issue: 24, 20 Nov. 1997, Pages: 2026 2027, hereafter referred to as Okumura).

Art Unit: 2133

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 4.

The 3GPP document substantially teaches the claimed invention described in claims 1 and 3 (as rejected above).

However the 3GPP document does not explicitly teach the specific use of selecting the rate matching pattern as a function of interleaver depth.

Okumura, in an analogous art, teaches use of selecting the rate matching pattern as a function of interleaver depth (Figure 2 of Okumura teaches that the frame structure is determined by the slot length of the interleaver).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the 3GPP document with the teachings of Okumura by including use of selecting the rate matching pattern as a function of interleaver depth. This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that use of selecting the rate matching pattern as a function of interleaver depth would have provided the opportunity to match interleaved data rates to channel rates.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 21.

The 3GPP document and Okumura substantially teaches the claimed invention described in claims 1-20 (as rejected above).

However the 3GPP document and Okumura does not explicitly teach the specific use of filling a matrix row-by-row and then reading column-by-column.

The Examiner asserts that the 3GPP document and Okumura teaches a matrix interleaver but does not teach the interleaving algorithm. The Examiner asserts that it would be obvious to use one of the most commonly known algorithms in the art for interleaving data based on the simplicity of the algorithm and ease of implementation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the 3GPP document and Okumura by including use of filling a matrix row-by-row and then reading column-by-column. This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that use of filling a matrix row-by-row and then reading column-by-column would have provided the opportunity to use one of the most commonly known algorithms in the art for interleaving data based on the simplicity of the algorithm and ease of implementation.

7. Claims 11 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the 3GPP document (3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP);Technical Specification Group (TSG) Radio Access Network (RAN); Working Group 1 (WG1); Multiplexing and channel coding (FDD), TS 25.212 V1.0.0 (1999-04)) and Okumura et al. (Okumura, Y.; Adachi, F.; Variable rate transmission and blind rate detection for coherent DS-CDMA mobile radio, Electronics Letters, Volume: 33, Issue: 24, 20 Nov. 1997, Pages: 2026 – 2027, hereafter referred to as Okumura) in view of Yi; Byung Kwan (US 5978365 A).

Art Unit: 2133

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 11 and 17-20.

The 3GPP document and Okumura substantially teaches the claimed invention described in claim 1 (as rejected above).

However the 3GPP document and Okumura do not explicitly teach the specific use of a puncturing matrix.

YI, in an analogous art, teaches use of a puncturing matrix (see Figure 15 in Yi). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the 3GPP document and Okumura with the teachings of Yi by including use of a puncturing matrix. This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that use of a puncturing matrix would have provided the opportunity to puncture data for a rate-matching scheme.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph D. Torres whose telephone number is (571) 272-3829. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR System, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

Joseph D. Torres, PhD Primary Examiner Art Unit 2133